



JEFFERSON PARK EXPANSION **PROJECT ADVISORY TEAM MEETING #6**

Thursday, May 18, 2006
Jefferson Lawn Bowling Clubhouse

MEETING SUMMARY

PAT Members Present: Mira Latoszek Shellwyn Badger
Stuart McFeely Nancy Spurgeon

PAT Members Absent: Bruce Bentley Steve Galey Mike Carney
Bert Caoili Monique Cherrier

Other attendees: Randy Smith, Jefferson Community Center Coordinator
Randy Robinson, Project Manager
Andy Mitton, The Berger Partnership

Meeting Facilitator: Cheryl Fraser, Parks South Resource Manager

Welcome: Meeting was started promptly at 6:30 pm.

Guest Comments: The neighborhood play area group presented the ideas from their separate meetings about possible play area features including the Glacier Mountain, water ideas, and animal sculptures.
Additional comments included a young girl's comment that the idea of water spray play was good. A mother added that other ideas will come out later. Another mother expressed that the mountain idea was good.

Previous Meeting Notes: Meeting notes from 1/19/06 and 3/16/06 were approved.

Project Progress Report: **Randy Robinson** gave a quick overview of the project schedule remaining for the Jefferson Park Expansion Project. This is the last PAT meeting but other Parks Department reviews will be taking place.

Design Development Presentation **Greg Brower and Andy Mitton** from the The Berger Partnership presented the design development plans with detailed description of grading, pathways, major elements, storm water system, viewpoints, entries, plaza, and play area.

Design Development Questions & Discussion **Mira** asked about irrigating the entries.
Greg responded – yes.
Mira asked what about the little path west of the golf driving range, what about the oval shaped planting area there?
Greg responded that the idea was for a future or alternative community garden space.
Mira then asked about the future third tennis court? It looks like a future tennis court will crowd the play area spaces. Can the play area be shifted to the west?
Those are good points, we will study that further, yes there is room for shifting (Greg).
Shellwyn asked about the area north of the community center, what were

Design Development
Questions & Discussion
(Continued)

the uses there?

Greg explained that the future community center expansion would dictate how those spaces would be organized and at this point, the space would be open lawn area a place holder for future spaces related to the community center.

Randy Smith asked about the location of the Dept. of Ecology Air Quality Monitoring Station? **Greg** pointed out both the temporary location and the proposed permanent location.

Randy S. asked: where do SPU trucks come in and how often? What about SPU Security people? Will they still be coming on site with a buried reservoir in place?

Randy Robinson will ask SPU.

Randy S. said that the cave idea at the play area seems questionable – people can hide in spaces like that and its not good around a play area where there are kids. The fabric canopy idea is not as good as using trees for shade. The existing play equipment is in pretty good shape – can it be moved over to the 15th and Dakota (southwest) area and be re-used?

Randy R. responded that equipment reuse is a very questionable considering the possibility of damaging the equipment with the move and the cost of infrastructure and surfacing that we would still need.

Randy R. then asked: How about other areas such as the new parking and basketball courts?

Stuart asked **Greg** to explain the path that goes over the culvert in the storm water drainage area. How much vertical is there?

The sides slope at about 3:1 down about 4 feet to the detention pond area.

(**Greg**). Is that too steep?

Stuart: it just looks odd.

Andy Mitton added that the Promenade path needs to be ADA accessible for slope.

Stuart then asked if the project were on budget at this point?

Yes, the elements shown on the Design Development Plan are what can be constructed in 2008 with our budget (**Greg**), Inflation may change that over the next two years.

Cheryl asked if the cost estimate included inflation? **Greg** responded yes.

Randy added that “normal” inflation factors have been used. However, the past 3 years have seen abnormal cost increases and 2006 and 2007 may also be higher than average. Construction cost inflation is a very big problem for this project.

Stuart asked if a cost consultant is being used?

Greg responded that a cost estimating subconsultant is on the team and will be brought in shortly.

Stuart: What is on the chopping block if you need to cut the budget in the next year or so?

Randy then asked what the PAT’s recommendation for cuts would be?

Mira suggested that the first cuts should be with irrigated lawn.

Cheryl stated that costs are huge for labor if the decision to keep the grass green is made after the decision to cut out irrigation has been made.

The recommendation should be that watered grass lawn should be limited (**Mira**).

Randy S. asked what the sports plateau has for irrigation?

Greg explained that the sports plateau currently does not have automatic irrigation proposed, only manual quick couplers.

**Design Development
Questions & Discussion
(Continued)**

A length discussion ensued about how to deal with the sports field maintenance if no irrigation is provided. The possibility of providing automatic irrigation for the soccer field only was discussed. The limits on Parks Dept. use of fertilizers was mentioned as a major limiting factor over the reservoir. Synthetic turf was discussed. Parks Dept. will continue to work on this problem for a while longer.

Cheryl mentioned that some sports groups have provided people to help drag hoses and water fields that do not have automatic irrigation systems.

Stuart commented that maybe the approach to cost cutting would involve cutting a little from many areas. For instance: take out the broken concrete markers at the entries; in fact, take those out anyway.

Is broken concrete a bad idea in general or just at the pillars (**Greg**). If we could get rock for free instead, would that be a better material?

Stuart: I don't know, maybe. But the cost of rock usually isn't the rock itself, but the moving, placing, etc.

Mira commented that the design of the Great Meadow has become a giant separate space. It would be more interesting if spaces moved into the large meadow from the edges. There should be more connections from the plaza and the northwest corner also. Please look at ways of connecting the big lawn with the surrounding uses. There should be more design thought put into the edges. The big lawn may just be empty a lot of the time.

Greg suggested that the Great Meadow will be used extensively because it's a large open green space – that alone will draw people to play Frisbee, throw a ball around, kick a ball around, etc.

Mira: what about changing the irrigation and not irrigating out to the path edge? What about using wild flowers instead of lawn?

Greg: if you take out the path itself, then the oval disappears and the space could be irrigated in any number of different ways.

Randy S. thought little lookouts could be added around the oval.

Stuart thought otherwise: Don't design by committee. The current plan follows the pattern of Olmsted's Strawberry Fields in Central Park with large open spaces in the center of the park and then out to smaller, informal spaces on the edges. Don't micromanage this design. Keep the big picture.

Nancy S. agreed with Stuart: the big open lawn area of the Great Meadow will be used by kids a lot. Irrigated open grass areas are very desirable. The play area is looking good – the work of the subcommittee has been great.

**Questions and
Comments from guests**

Larry McCann (coach from Beacon Hill Soccer) says that the idea of green grass is good for kids. Is the soccer field the same size as before? Yes. (**Greg**)

What about the second baseball field? (**Larry**)

Andy Mitton then showed another plan (in the works) that had a second baseball field with 60 foot base paths oriented with home plate in the NW corner and an overlay of a second soccer field. There would be difficulty scheduling the two baseball fields at the same time unless they were both little league or softball.

Larry: what about a sand based soccer field over the reservoir.

Randy R. responded that he had suggested the possibility of a sand/silt field at a PAT meeting and someone (maybe Mike Carney) had not liked the idea. Generally soccer players do not like sand/silt fields like Washington Park, Lower Woodland #2, etc. Once again though, it seems crazy to build

**Questions and
Comments from guests**
(Continued)

a natural turf field over the reservoir that we know Parks can't maintain properly without fertilizer. Randy will continue to suggest the possibility of sand/silt at other meetings.

Frederica Merrell: What about Parks and Berger developing another plan that shows the full development of the whole park to be used as a tool for future funding?

Several people responded that the plan she is referring to is the Schematic Design Plan that has been completed and is on the web. Can she print it off the web? (**Randy**).

Frederica said that she wants a full size plan, in color showing the whole park for the park to be laminated and given to her by Parks.

Randy responded that Parks would provide a laminated Schematic Design Plan.

Frederica then commented that the play area looked too crowded and needs more room. The future tennis court will crowd the play area.

Greg reminded everyone of the scale of this plan; the water spray area alone is as big as the whole clubhouse building we were meeting in. But, the Berger Partnership will look at the play area again regarding the possibility of a future tennis court.

Glenn Herlihy commented that the northern and western areas need more wildlife habitat.

Andy mentioned that the trees that are being preserved in the northwest area will be good bird habitat. The number of trees has been reduced for budget reasons but could be added in with neighborhood tree planting projects.

Randy R. added that the whole western side of the park holds great opportunity for wildlife habitat (there is an existing wetland there) but is not in the scope of this project – a future neighborhood project with Audubon would be a possibility.

Mark Holland stated that artificial turf has environmental problems. Crumb rubber made from recycled tires has heavy metals and is flammable.

George Robertson commented that the I-90 lid park has only 2 feet of soil over concrete and is just fine. Keep the areas as multiple use areas and not single use.

Another guest commented that the “mountain” in the play area is too small. If it is only 4-5 feet high then it's not a mountain.

Written comments from **Larry Hsu** were submitted and included three points:

1. the aesthetic value of lawn and the appeal to the public should be considered
2. maybe some areas could be mulched with wood chips until future funding made it possible to provide lawns
3. how about keeping the space for the 3rd tennis court but not building it yet?

Conclusion:

Randy concluded the meeting by thanking everyone for their participation in the PAT and announcing that the project information will be on display at the Beacon Hill Festival and in the community center over the summer.

Meeting Summary By:

rfr

Additional Information is Available:

- Park web site: <http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/proparks/projects/JeffersonPark.htm>
- Randy Robinson, Seattle Parks Project Manager, (206) 684-7035; randy.robinson@seattle.gov
- Cheryl Fraser, Parks Resources Manager, (206) 684-8016; cheryl.fraser@seattle.gov